Office Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
MAR 21 1963
JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1962

No. 97

THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD COMPANY, CANTON RAILROAD COMPANY, THE CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO RAILWAY COMPANY, NORFOLK AND WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY, THE PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD COMPANY, READING COMPANY, AND WESTERN MARYLAND RAILWAY COMPANY,

Appellants,

v.

BOSTON AND MAINE RAILROAD, ET AL.,

Appellees.

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

REPLY BRIEF FOR APPELLANTS

JERVIS LANGDON, JR.,
302 Baltimore & Ohio Bldg.,
Baltimore 1, Md.,
Attorney for Appellant Railroads.

Of Counsel:
RICHARD R. BONGARTZ,
ROBERT B. CLAYTOR,
JOHN W. HANIFIN,
JOHN HENRY LEWIN,
WILLIAM C. PURNELL,
WILLIAM P. QUINN.

March 21, 1963.

The Daily Record Co., Baltimore 3, Md.

Table of Contents

	PAGE
Reply Argument	2
I. The Failure of Appellees to Prove the Proposed Equalizing Rates to be Reasonable	2
II. The Failure of Appellees to Prove the Proposed Equalizing Rates to be Non-Preferential and Non-Prejudicial	7
III. The Special Failure of Proof on Part of Boston Appellees	13
Conclusion	14
Appendix A	15
Appendix B	16
Appendix C	17-18
Appendix D	19-20

Table of Cases

Boston and Maine Railroad v. United States, 153 F. Supp. 952	13
Iron Ore (ex-Labrador, Canada) to Youngstown, Ohio, Area, 302 I.C.C. 109	6
New York v. United States, 331 U.S. 284, 305	11
New York Central Railroad Co. v. United States, 207 F. Supp. 483, 493	4, 6
Texas & Pacific Ry. Co. v. U. S., 289 U.S. 627	12
United States v. Illinois Cent. R.R., 263 U.S. 515, 527	11

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1962

No. 97

THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD COMPANY, CANTON RAILROAD COMPANY, THE CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO RAILWAY COMPANY, NORFOLK AND WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY, THE PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD COMPANY, READING COMPANY, AND WESTERN MARYLAND RAILWAY COMPANY,

Appellants,

v.

BOSTON AND MAINE RAILROAD, ET AL.,

Appellees.

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

REPLY BRIEF FOR APPELLANTS

On the primary issue in this litigation the appellant railroads are in complete agreement with the position taken in the reply briefs of the appellants in No. 98 and the Interstate Commerce Commission as appellant in No. 99. This reply brief will be concerned with the principal point that in promoting the equalizing rates to and from New York and the other northern tier ports the appellee railroads lost before the Commission because they failed to sustain

the burden of proving them lawful under section 15(7), and in this Court, they should lose for the same reason.

The lower court's decision, the effect of which was to relieve the appellees of their burden of proof by imposing a parity of rail rates without regard to acknowledged transportation standards, should be summarily reversed. There is no valid reason for a remand.

REPLY ARGUMENT

I. The Failure of Appellees to Prove the Proposed Equalizing Rates to be Reasonable.

When the appellee railroads filed their equalizing rates from New York and the other northern tier ports, they assumed the burden of proving such rates to be "just and reasonable." This is the clear mandate of section 15(7) of the Interstate Commerce Act, and as stated in the opinion of the lower court (R. 3999):

> "Under 49 U.S.C. §15(7), the plaintiffs had the burden of proof to show that the proposed rates are 'just and reasonable' within the meaning of section 1(5), free from unjust discrimination prohibited by section 2 and that they contain no undue preference or prejudice proscribed by section 3(1)."

In the proposed report of Examiner Boat (which followed extensive hearings before the Commission at which the appellees and appellants as well as many other parties submitted evidence) it was recommended to the Commission that (R. 3729):

> "The Commission should find: (1) That respondents [appellees] have not shown that their proposed rates would be just and reasonable; (2) that they have not shown that they would be reasonably related to those on like traffic between the same interior points and the southern tier ports; and (3) that their proposed rates would result in undue preference and advantage of

> the northern tier ports, particularly New York, and undue prejudice and disadvantage to the southern tier ports."

The Commission, however, limited its ultimate findings on the relationship issue, holding in its original report of December 5, 1960 (R. 3806-7):

> "We find that the respondents' [appellees'] proposed rates are not shown to be reasonably related to the present rates on like traffic between the same interior points and the southern tier ports, and that the proposed rates would result in undue preference of and advantage to the northern tier ports as a group and in undue prejudice and disadvantage to the southern tier ports. * * *"

Upon reconsideration the Commission's disposition was the same (R. 3855):

> "Upon reconsideration, we find that the proposed rates to and from Albany, New York, Boston, and Portland, separately and collectively, are not shown to be reasonably related to the present rates on like traffic to and from the southern tier ports, and would cause undue preference of and advantage to the named ports and undue prejudice and disadvantage to the southern tier ports. * * *".

The Commission, in other words, concluded that on the relationship issue the appellee railroads had failed to sustain their burden of proof. It was not necessary for the Commission to go further in disposing of the litigation.

Now, however, with a decision of the lower court reversing the Commission on the relationship issue, it is vital for the appellee railroads to show that, aside from producing a lawful relationship, the proposed equalizing rates are "just and reasonable" from the point of view of level. This is an inescapable part of the burden of proof of any carrier proposing rate changes under section 15(7).

Where do the appellees discover such a finding? They produce one out of thin air by arguing (Brief of Appellee Railroads, at p. 55):

> "When the Commission issued its Original Report, fourteen months after the Examiner's report, it was logical that the Commission should first dispose of the just and reasonable aspects of the rates proposed by Appellee Railroads before taking up the issue of rate relationship. It did so. The Commission found no basis for declaring that the proposed rates of Appellee Railroads had not been shown to be just and reasonable. It rejected the adverse finding recommended by the Examiner (R. 3807; Certified Transcript of Oral Argument before the District Court, p. 73 (Oct. 16, 1961))."

This is indeed a novel approach.

The Commission it is true did not incorporate in its ultimate findings the Examiner's conclusion that the equalizing rates had not been shown to be just and reasonable. But certainly this omission cannot be converted into an affirmative finding that the rates were shown to be just and reasonable.

The appellee railroads say that the Commission, by omitting the Examiner's conclusion, "rejected" it. This is not so. There was no rejection, and appellees point to none. Nor can a rejection be implied. In fact, the exact opposite is true. The Commission in its report pointed out that the appellees had failed to prove that the proposed equalizing rates to and from New York would be compensatory (R. 3797). In the opinion of the lower court it is noted that the Commission "refused to find the rates compensatory * * *" (R. 4001). Rates that are not shown to be compensatory can hardly qualify as just and reasonable. Even compensatory rates may fall short of being just and reasonable. *New York Central Railroad Co. v. United States*, 207 F. Supp. 483, 495.

In the circumstances the appellees are forced to rely upon the analysis by the lower court of the evidence before the Commission and that court's conclusion that "the plaintiffs [appellees] certainly established prima facie that the proposed rate schedule is just and reasonable" (R. 4001).

The appellees do not and cannot justify this performance by the lower court of a function specifically assigned to the Commission by the Interstate Commerce Act. Whether or not the appellees sustained the burden of proving their rates to be just and reasonable was a question for the Commission to decide, certainly in the first instance. Here, by refusing to find the rates to be compensatory, the Commission did in effect decide that question — against the appellees.

The finding to the contrary by the lower court is defended by the appellees on the grounds that (1) the standards of reasonableness used by the court were proper, (2) a cost study by appellees "would have been an impossible task," and (3) the Commission found no "warrant" for such a study (Brief of Appellee Railroads, at pp. 55-63).

In this reply brief it is not our purpose to point up the shortcomings in the standards adopted by the lower court to find the equalizing rates to be just and reasonable. This has been done previously (Brief of Appellant Railroads, at pp. 15-18). Their defense in the brief of appellee railroads only emphasizes their defective character. An example is appellees' heavy reliance upon the fact that revenues under the proposed rates "would be about double the average revenues produced by all its [New York Central's] other freight operations" (Brief of Appellee Railroads, at p. 56). Such a revenue level, any revenue level, is a completely meaningless standard unless related to relevant expenses. In the case of the New York Central the point is beyond argument. During the course of the hearings before the

Commission there was public acknowledgment that the New York Central's incurred in the one year of 1957 a *loss* of $10,350,000 on its freight service to New York, including the "lighterage service which enhances New York harbor" (R. 3624).

Moreover, it is impossible to take seriously appellees' argument that a cost study "would have been an impossible task." Appellees are equipped to make cost studies, and they do so at any time when it serves their purpose (R. 1309-10; 1314-5). See *Iron Ore (ex-Labrador, Canada) to Youngstown, Ohio, Area*, 302 I.C.C. 109; Cf. *New York Central Railroad Co. v. United States*, 207 F. Supp. 483, 493. In fact, the New York Central either had completed, or was in the process of completing, studies of its New York harbor costs at the time of the hearing in this proceeding before the Commission (R. 98-100; 1310-1; 1360-2; 1363-4). But to this record the appellees refused to contribute a single cost figure of their own. As noted in the Commission's report, they assailed as "unrepresentative" the cost computations of the two appellants with service to and from New York, but they failed to support their criticism with evidence of *their* operating costs (R. 3795).

The conclusion is inescapable that the appellees, knowing their costs, could not afford to display them.

Appellees' final suggestion that the Commission found a cost study not "warranted" is grossly misleading. In an effort to force the appellees to disclose their New York costs, appellant railroads, before the hearings at the Commission began, requested an investigation of New York terminal costs to —

> insure that the costs of all of the lines serving New York would be before the Commission when deciding the fundamental and primary issue of whether the suspended rates are reasonably compensatory (R. 45).

The appellees contested this petition, and the Commission denied it because of the delay involved (R. 59). But in doing so, the Commission pointed out that "the burden of establishing the lawfulness of the proposed rates in these proceedings rests upon respondents [appellee railroads]" (R. 59).

The effort on the part of the lower court to make its own findings of reasonableness, reflecting such a false understanding of the evidence before the Commission, cannot stand. Nor is there any reason for remand. By refusing to supply data as to their own costs, the appellees failed to sustain the burden of proving their rates to be compensatory and, in consequence, as noted in the lower court's opinion, the Commission "refused to find the rates compensatory" (R. 4001). This ended the matter. Rates not shown to be compensatory can hardly be held to be just and reasonable.

II. The Failure of Appellees to Prove the Proposed Equalizing Rates to be Non-Preferential and Non-Prejudicial.

On the issue of rate relations, the appellee railroads *also* failed to sustain the burden of proof. In fact, as noted above, the Commission made an affirmative finding that the equalizing rates "would cause undue preference of and advantage" to the northern ports and "undue prejudice and disadvantage to the southern tier ports" (R. 3855).

The basic question here presented is, in a controversy over the relationship of rates on export-import traffic is the Commission entitled to give weight to the transportation standard, including relative distances and relative costs,[1] or must it give "overriding consideration" to an

[1] In the Brief for the United States, at p. 33, it is said that "we would agree" with greater reliance upon cost factors.

equalization of rail-ocean charges through the competing ports? The Commission answered the question by recognizing the transportation standard as relevant. The lower court, upsetting the Commission, held in effect that the transportation standard was beside the point, and that parity rates must be imposed in any event.

Before dealing with this basic question, it is important to understand that the appellants win if the transportation standard plays any part. As found in the original report of the Commission (R. 3805-6):

> The greater distance of the northern tier ports from the affected territory, and the higher costs of service to and from those ports, are firmly established. * * *

Again in its report on reconsideration, the Commission described the "geographical, transportation, and cost advantages" of the appellant railroads and ports as "fully substantiated of record" (R. 3854).

One instance where a southern tier port has longer distances is Hampton Roads, and the appellee railroads point to the "damaging discrimination against New York" arising from the fact that Hampton Roads, with the same rates as Baltimore, has a 3-cent advantage although "actually 30 miles farther away, than New York." (Brief of Appellee Railroads, at p. 31). But rail transportation costs to and from Hampton Roads are much lower than to and from New York. In fact, on export-import traffic to and from Hampton Roads appellants' costs are only about 50 per cent of the revenues. (See Appendix A to this brief.) This means that such costs are lower than those at New York by about 40 cents per 100 pounds — as compared to a differential of only 3 cents per 100 pounds in the rates. (See Appendix B to this brief.)

Certainly a cost difference of 40 cents justifies a rate difference of 3 cents.[2]

The lesser distances[3] at the ports of Baltimore and Philadelphia are also supported by strikingly lower costs. In Appendix C to this brief is found a summary of adjusted

---

[2] Actually, the rate differential should be much more than 3 cents. In its principal decision the Commission pointed out (R. 3802-3):

> To show that New York's competitive position is far superior to that of Hampton Roads, a study was made by the Chesapeake & Ohio for the year ended June 30, 1957, which disclosed that substantial tonnages from the affected territory moved to New York notwithstanding the lower rates to the southern tier ports. For example, of 5,870 carloads originated by the Chesapeake & Ohio in that territory during this period and exported either through Hampton Roads or New York, 4,654 carloads were exported through New York. Thus, notwithstanding its 3-cent advantage this carrier was able to hold only one out of five carloads which it originated. In the same period it handled for export through Hampton Roads only 501 carloads originated by the New York Central and 240 carloads originated by the Erie, which were turned over to it by those respondents.
>
> To ascertain the effect of the 3-cent differential, a study was made of manufactured iron and steel traffic for export from the Pittsburgh district, from which the rates to New York and Hampton Roads are the same. During August and October 1955 and April, May, and June, 1956, 178,241 tons were moved from that district through New York by five respondents and only 545 tons moved through Newport News. During the test year the movement from the affected territory to New York of this commodity aggregated 580,073 tons, or over 100 times the 5,416 tons handled through Hampton Roads and over 60 percent more than through Baltimore.
>
> A parity of rates to Hampton Roads and New York also obtains on export traffic from the Province of Ontario, Canada, served by the Chesapeake & Ohio and the New York Central. In the year ended with June, 1957, only 14 carloads moved through Hampton Roads from origins on the Chesapeake & Ohio in that Province, as compared with 553 carloads from those origins to New York. The Chesapeake & Ohio was unable to attract a single carload originated by the New York Central in that territory for movement to Newport News.

[3] It is to be emphasized that the rate adjustment upheld by the Commission does not reflect distance as such. If it did, Baltimore's differential would be two or three times greater than 3 cents (Ex. 51, pp. 17-20). Moreover, the differentials have not changed as the

full costs of transporting representative import commodities from New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore to typical destinations in differential territory (R. 2391-2399). Appendix D covers representative export commodities from origins in the same territory (R. 2403-2412).

These cost differences cannot be discredited on the ground that they do no more than reflect differences in distance (Brief for the United States, at p. 32; Brief of Boston Appellees, at p. 37). As vividly demonstrated in the case of the drastically lower costs (see Appendix B) to and from Hampton Roads with its 30 miles of greater distance than New York, relative costs, as an integral part of transportation standard, supply completely independent support for the Commission's decision. Moreover, aside from the lower costs of the appellee railroads attributable to the shorter distances of Philadelphia and Baltimore, a more important influence is their lower terminal costs at tidewater. These obviously have no relation to distance. Contrary to the intimation in the brief of the United States (at p. 32), these costs were computed after painstaking special investigations on the ground, including time switching studies, analyses of marine logs, and computations of the costs of operating and maintaining piers (R. 2387-8). Their restatement by the Commission appears in its report (R. 3798).

rate-level and the value of goods have increased over a period of more than 80 years. As found by the Commission (R. 3805):

> The present differentials are smaller than they would be if allowed to be set by competitive factors, and also much smaller, relatively, than when initially established. * * *

Port costs, export-import (boxcars—general cargo)

Items	New York	Boston	Baltimore	Philadelphia
Costs per car:				
Switching (including some station expenses)	$28.05	$26.03	$20.19	$22.37
Float bridge, car float, lighterage bureau	9.31			
Car detention		12.24		
Total cost per car	37.36	38.27	20.19	22.37
Costs per ton:				
Platform handling (including some station expenses)	4.58	3.22	2.76	3.58
Lighterage and trucking in lieu of lighterage	4.99		.35	
Total cost per ton	9.57	3.22	3.11	3.58

On the basis of the same loading used by the northern carriers in computing the appellee New Haven's terminal costs at Boston the differences per car at the several ports in railroad terminal costs, as computable from the figures appearing in the foregoing table, are (R. 3364):

	Terminal Cost Box cars—36.7-ton loading
Boston	$127.46
New York	302.45
Philadelphia	121.54
Baltimore	106.34

Returning now to the basic issue above referred to, is the Commission's use of the transportation standard in deciding this case to be set aside in favor of an imposed equalization of rail-ocean charges? The answer clearly is negative.

In deciding rate relationship questions generally the Commission properly employs the transportation standard. There can be no question on this point. *United States v. Illinois Cent. R.R.*, 263 U.S. 515, 524; *New York v. United States*, 331 U.S. 284, 305. The same principle applies when the relationship in controversy involves export-import traffic. Whatever may have been the rule at the time

of the decision of the majority of the Court in *Texas & Pacific Ry. Co. v. U. S.*, 289 U.S. 627, the Congress, in subsequently giving to ports the right to complain of undue preference and undue prejudice under section 3, made no distinction. The Senate's defeat of the Long amendment,[1] which would have provided that "Where rates and charges of common carriers to ports are made as reductions to equalize rates to ports served by competing carriers, it shall not be termed undue preference or discrimination" was a rejection of appellees' basic argument. The Congress specifically empowered the Commission, in deciding cases of the kind here presented, to take into account relative distances and costs and other transportation factors — exactly as the Commission has done in this instance.

On the transportation standard the appellants refused to supply *any* cost evidence — the type of evidence "with which we [United States] would agree." (Brief for United States, at p. 33.) They concentrated on questions of competition and attempted to show that, since the equalization of ocean rates many years ago, traffic at the northern tier ports had fallen off relatively. Appellees were unable to prove this, however, in reference to traffic moving to and from differential territory. The record contains no reliable figures indicating any trend in the flow of this traffic. In consequence, the appellees resorted to overall port figures to prove New York's relative decline. But, as the Commission clearly indicated in its report, the influences producing such a result, including the economic growth of other sections of the country and the movement of traffic under rates not involved in this proceeding, have nothing to do with the particular rate adjustment here involved (R. 3759-3760).

[1] 79 Cong. Rec. 10596, 10619.

III. The Special Failure of Proof on Part of Boston Appellees.

In the Boston brief an effort is made to forsake New York and to strike for lower rates for Boston alone. The acknowledged target is the bulk traffic that the record (which was closed prior to the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway) shows passing through the southern tier ports.

Lower rates at Boston than at New York were not an open issue in the proceeding and certainly could not be authorized until there had been an opportunity to review the question. Boston's prior efforts to obtain such rates have been fiercely and successfully resisted by New York.

Moreover, Boston did not sustain the burden of proving such lower-than-New York rates lawful. The target is bulk cargo and yet, as we have seen, the Boston carriers themselves submitted the following revenue-cost relationships on export grain (R. 3368):

	Commodity Revenue	*Out-of-Pocket Costs*	*Ratio of Out-of-Pocket Costs to Revenue*
(2)	(4)	(7)	(8)
Wheat	$880.00	$1,127.03	128.07%
Corn	880.00	1,185.03	134.66
Wheat Flour	379.50	432.06	113.85
Corn Meal	438.70	533.33	121.57
Soybean Oil Meal	725.20	862.54	118.94
Malt	360.80	515.11	142.77

On import iron ore the Commission has already held to be non-compensatory from Boston the same level of rates as applicable from the Southern tier ports. *Boston and Maine Railroad v. United States*, 153 F. Supp. 952.

To obtain rates lower than New York, Boston would also have to justify a special type of discrimination. It would not be a case of merely having lower rates despite 200

miles of additional service, but of having lower rates in the face of higher rates at ports such as New York and Albany that are *intermediate* on the same routes. Discrimination of this type can only be justified in a special proceeding under section 4. There has been no application for such special relief on the part of the Boston appellees.

CONCLUSION

The judgment below should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

JERVIS LANGDON, JR.,
302 Baltimore & Ohio Bldg.,
Baltimore 1, Md.,
Attorney for Appellant Railroads.

Of Counsel:
RICHARD R. BONGARTZ,
ROBERT B. CLAYTOR,
JOHN W. HANIFIN,
JOHN HENRY LEWIN,
WILLIAM C. PURNELL,
WILLIAM P. QUINN.

March 21, 1963.

APPENDICES A, B, C and D

APPENDIX A

(Based on
Witness Petterson's
[fol. 4177] Exhibit R. 3024)

STATEMENT SHOWING 1957 REVENUE AND COSTS PER CWT.— DIFFERENTIAL TERRITORY POINTS AND HAMPTON ROADS
(CENTS PER CWT.)

Origin or Destination	Commodity	Type of Car	Cost Per Cwt.	Revenue Per Cwt.	Percent Cost To Revenue
Chicago, Ill.	Candy	Box	67.826	109.480	61.943
	Tractor Engines	Flat	35.427	92.000	38.507
Decatur, Ill.	Elec. Instruments	Box	101.194	302.929	33.405
Fort Wayne, Ind.	Powdered Milk	Box	62.185	81.000	76.772
Muncie, Ind.	Glass Blocks	Box	54.832	119.000	46.077
Ashland, Ky.	Extract Tanning	Box	36.421	83.000	43.881
Louisville, Ky.	Leaf Tobacco	Box	69.066	90.135	76.625
	Neoprene Rubber	Box	42.195	96.240	43.844
	Neoprene Rubber	Open Top	25.543	95.000	26.887
Detroit, Mich.	Autos K.D.	Open Top	46.506	115.000	40.440
	Burlap	Box	69.858	87.853	79.517
Grand Rapids, Mich.	Cotton Linters	Box	58.568	74.730	78.373
	Machinery	Box	72.787	147.000	49.515
St. Louis, Mo.	Shortening	Box	58.153	87.000	66.843
	Grass Seed	Box	85.798	124.544	68.890
Cincinnati, Ohio	Steel Ingots	Open Top	18.915	51.913	36.436
Columbus, Ohio	Butter Oil	Box	54.036	95.703	56.462
Lima, Ohio	Mill Rolls	Open Top	30.774	109.000	28.233
Toledo, Ohio	Auto Parts	Box	64.570	103.536	62.365
	Tractor Treads	Open Top	47.217	107.499	43.923
	Auto Parts	Flat	62.056	123.219	50.362
Charleston, W. Va.	Chemicals	Box	46.703	81.000	57.658
Huntington, W. Va.	Nickel	Open Top	17.379	105.000	16.551
	Nickel	Box	58.179	105.000	55.409
			1,286.188	2,586.781	49.722

LINE-HAUL OUT-OF-POCKET COSTS BETWEEN NEWPORT NEWS-NORFOLK, VIRGINIA, VERSUS NEW YORK, NEW YORK AND ALL DIFFERENTIAL TERRITORY PLUS FULL PORT TERMINAL AND PIER COSTS

All Differential Territory	NEWPORT NEWS-NORFOLK, VIRGINIA				NEW YORK, NEW YORK				Differences Newport News-Norfolk Virginia, under New York, New York		
		Out-of-Pocket Costs				Out-of-Pocket Costs					
	Distances* 1	Per 100 Pounds 2	Per Ton 2,000 Pounds 3	Per Car 55,400 Pounds 4	Distances* 5	Per 100 Pounds 6	Per Ton 2,000 Pounds 7	Per Car 55,400 Pounds 8	Per 100 Pounds 9	Per Ton 2,000 Pounds 10	Per Car 55,400 Pounds 11
1. West Virginia	546	$0.47619	$ 9.52	$263.81	719	$0.90866	$18.17	$503.40	$0.43247	$8.65	$239.59
2. Kentucky	697	.51769	10.35	286.80	888	.98469	19.69	545.52	.46700	9.34	258.72
3. Ohio	739	.53670	10.73	297.33	744	.91991	18.40	509.63	.38321	7.67	212.30
4. Indiana	898	.60520	12.10	335.28	941	1.00854	20.17	558.73	.40334	8.07	223.45
5. Michigan	1,029	.62170	12.43	344.42	842	.96400	19.28	534.06	.34230	6.85	189.64
6. Wisconsin	1,184	.69470	13.89	384.86	1,044	1.05488	21.10	584.40	.36018	7.21	199.54
7. Illinois	1,097	.69470	13.89	384.86	1,133	1.09492	21.90	606.59	.40022	8.01	221.73
8. Iowa	1,201	.70020	14.00	387.91	1,202	1.12596	22.52	623.78	.42576	8.52	235.87
9. Missouri	1,171	.72820	14.56	403.42	1,212	1.13046	22.61	626.27	.40226	8.05	222.85
10. Averages	951	$0.61870	$12.37	$342.76	970	$1.01978	$20.40	$564.96	$0.40108	$8.03	$222.20

* Based, in each case, on class rate miles plus 13 percent

SUMMARY OF REVENUES, COSTS AND RATIOS
REPRESENTATIVE MOVEMENTS OF
IMPORT TRAFFIC TERMINATING IN DIFFERENTIAL TERRITORY
VIA
PORTS OF NEW YORK, PHILADELPHIA AND BALTIMORE

Commodity		Type of Car	Average Weight (Tons)	Destination	New York, N.Y.		
Group No.	Description				Revenues	Costs	Ratio of Costs to Revenues
75	Coffee	B	31	Cincinnati, O.	$520.80	$625.50	120.1%
199	Prod. Agriculture — Coconut	B	22	Chicago, Ill.	422.40	557.41	132.0
399	Prod. Mines — Talc.	B	32	Crooksville, O.	384.00	583.09	151.8
399	Prod. Mines — Talc.	B	32	New Castle, Pa.	371.20	554.37	149.3
399	Prod. Mines — Talc.	B	32	Sebring, O.	384.00	561.55	146.2
415	Plywood	B	22	Warsaw, Ind.	431.20	522.81	121.2
415	Plywood	B	22	Rockford, Ill.	484.00	584.57	120.8
523	Rubber — Crude	B	35	Akron, O.	637.00	611.01	95.9
555	Aluminum — Bar, Ingot, Pig & Slab	B	14	Cleveland, O.	282.80	350.19	123.8
559	Copper — Bars & Ingots	B	50	Indianapolis, Ind.	1,010.10	918.28	90.9
559	Copper — Bars & Ingots	B	50	Cleveland, O.	640.00	805.42	125.8
571	Metals & Alloys, N.O.S. — Tin	B	29	Weirton, W. Va.	545.20	509.86	93.5
583	Mfd. Iron & Steel	G	40	Canton, O.	696.00	660.43	94.9
583	Mfd. Iron & Steel	B	40	Canton, O.	696.00	668.00	96.0
583	Mfd. Iron & Steel	G	40	Detroit, Mich.	824.00	704.89	85.5
583	Mfd. Iron & Steel	B	40	Detroit, Mich.	824.00	708.06	85.9
583	Mfd. Iron & Steel	G	40	Chicago, Ill.	896.00	826.10	92.2
583	Mfd. Iron & Steel	B	40	Chicago, Ill.	896.00	817.26	91.2
653	Woodpulp	B	41	Chagrin Falls, O.	508.40	691.61	136.0
653	Woodpulp	B	41	Middletown, O.	615.00	746.28	121.3
657	Newsprint Paper	B	26	Cincinnati, O.	431.60	557.85	129.3
657	Newsprint Paper	B	26	Cleveland, O.	390.00	501.93	128.7
657	Newsprint Paper	B	26	Toledo, O.	436.80	538.52	123.3
657	Newsprint Paper	B	26	Milwaukee, Wis.	535.60	612.05	114.3
657	Newsprint Paper	B	26	Pittsburgh, Pa.	338.00	458.43	135.6
671	Wallboard	B	22	Dayton, O.	356.40	492.74	138.3
671	Wallboard	B	22	Cleveland, O.	330.00	451.35	136.8

SUMMARY OF REVENUES, COSTS AND RATIOS
REPRESENTATIVE MOVEMENTS OF
IMPORT TRAFFIC TERMINATING IN DIFFERENTIAL TERRITORY
VIA
PORTS OF NEW YORK, PHILADELPHIA AND BALTIMORE

Destination	New York, N.Y.			Philadelphia, Pa.			Baltimore, Md.		
	Revenues	Costs	Ratio of Costs to Revenues	Revenues	Costs	Ratio of Costs to Revenues	Revenues	Costs	Ratio of Costs to Revenues
Cincinnati, O.	$520.80	$625.50	120.1%	$508.40	$415.19	81.7%	$502.20	$366.77	73.0%
Chicago, Ill.	422.40	557.41	132.0	413.60	401.96	97.2	409.20	373.95	91.4
Crooksville, O.	384.00	583.09	151.8	371.20	368.71	99.3	364.80	327.29	89.7
New Castle, Pa.	371.20	554.37	149.3	358.40	339.61	94.8	352.00	304.62	86.5
Sebring, O.	384.00	561.55	146.2	371.20	346.79	93.4	364.80	311.42	85.4
Warsaw, Ind.	431.20	522.81	121.2	422.40	366.30	86.7	418.00	338.38	81.0
Rockford, Ill.	484.00	584.57	120.8	475.20	429.12	90.3	470.80	401.11	85.2
Akron, O.	637.00	611.01	95.9	623.00	378.86	60.8	616.00	341.67	55.5
Cleveland, O.	282.80	350.19	123.8	277.20	243.30	87.8	274.40	221.46	80.7
Indianapolis, Ind.	1,010.10	918.28	90.9	900.00	596.78	66.3	980.00	535.77	54.7
Cleveland, O.	640.00	805.42	125.8	620.00	485.83	78.4	610.00	437.67	71.7
Weirton, W. Va.	545.20	509.86	93.5	533.60	312.89	58.6	527.80	279.73	53.0
Canton, O.	696.00	660.43	94.9	680.00	389.48	57.3	672.00	301.18	44.8
Canton, O.	696.00	668.00	96.0	680.00	405.81	59.7	672.00	364.54	54.2
Detroit, Mich.	824.00	704.89	85.5	808.00	472.32	58.5	800.00	390.57	48.8
Detroit, Mich.	824.00	708.00	85.9	808.00	480.43	59.5	800.00	445.07	55.6
Chicago, Ill.	896.00	826.10	92.2	880.00	555.16	63.1	872.00	466.86	53.5
Chicago, Ill.	896.00	817.26	91.2	880.00	555.06	63.1	872.00	513.80	58.9
Chagrin Falls, O.	508.40	691.66	136.0	492.80	425.19	86.4	483.80	383.62	79.3
Middletown, O.	615.00	746.28	121.3	598.60	478.15	79.9	590.40	425.04	72.0
Cincinnati, O.	431.60	557.85	129.3	421.20	377.30	89.6	416.00	333.57	80.2
Cleveland, O.	390.00	501.93	128.7	379.60	324.14	85.4	374.40	293.53	78.4
Toledo, O.	436.80	538.52	123.3	426.40	360.38	84.5	421.20	329.43	78.2
Milwaukee, Wis.	535.60	612.05	114.3	525.20	458.07	87.2	520.00	427.12	82.1
Pittsburgh, Pa.	338.00	458.43	135.6	327.60	279.26	85.2	322.40	248.31	77.0
Dayton, O.	356.40	492.74	138.3	347.60	337.28	97.0	343.20	300.87	87.7
Cleveland, O.	330.00	451.35	136.8	321.20	297.19	92.5	316.80	269.50	85.1

SUMMARY OF REVENUES, COSTS AND RATIOS
REPRESENTATIVE MOVEMENTS OF
IMPORT TRAFFIC TERMINATING IN DIFFERENTIAL TERRITORY
VIA
PORTS OF: NEW YORK, PHILADELPHIA AND BALTIMORE

Commodity		Type of Car	Average Weight (Tons)	New York, N.Y.			
Group No.	Description			Destination	Revenues	Costs	Ratio of Costs to Revenues
671	Wallboard	B	22	Massillon, O.	$303.60	$442.94	145.9%
671	Wallboard	B	22	Chicago, Ill.	444.40	557.41	125.4
723	Burlap Bagging	B	21	Indianapolis, Ind.	424.20	514.05	121.2
723	Burlap Bagging	B	21	Pittsburgh, Pa.	373.80	398.65	106.6
759	Sugar	B	39	Pittsburgh, Pa.	405.60	613.89	151.4
759	Sugar	B	39	Cleveland, O.	608.40	666.32	109.5
759	Sugar	B	39	Columbus, O.	639.60	690.88	108.0
759	Sugar	B	39	Detroit, Mich.	639.60	695.04	108.7
763	Food Prod., N.O.S. — Unfrozen	B	21	Cincinnati, O.	327.60	490.20	149.6
763	Food Prod., N.O.S. — Unfrozen	B	21	Cleveland, O.	289.80	438.70	151.4
763	Food Prod., N.O.S. — Unfrozen	B	21	Chicago, Ill.	403.20	542.98	134.7
763	Food Prod., N.O.S. — Unfrozen	B	21	Pittsburgh, Pa.	260.40	398.65	153.1
735	Rope, Cordage — Baler & Binder Twine	B	14	Cleveland, O.	226.80	350.19	154.4
735	Rope, Cordage — Baler & Binder Twine	B	14	Detroit, Mich.	252.00	369.49	146.6
735	Rope, Cordage — Baler & Binder Twine	B	14	Pittsburgh, Pa.	193.20	314.95	163.0
735	Rope, Cordage — Baler & Binder Twine	B	14	Dayton, O.	249.20	385.00	154.9
735	Rope, Cordage — Baler & Binder Twine	B	14	Madison, Wis.	330.40	461.51	139.7
499	Prod. Forests — Cork Waste	B	11	Beaver Falls, Pa.	178.20	279.07	156.6
323	Clay — Ball or China	B	50	New Castle, Pa.	520.00	775.90	149.2
323	Clay — Ball or China	B	50	Barberton, O.	570.00	799.71	140.3
323	Clay — Ball or China	B	50	Robinson, Ill.	780.00	983.05	126.0
35	Cotton Linters	B	20	Flint, Mich.	344.00	455.74	132.5
35	Cotton Linters	B	20	Chicago, Ill.	379.00	528.54	140.6
35	Cotton Linters	B	20	St. Louis, Mo.	404.00	575.41	142.4
545	Tanning Material — Divi Pods	B	29	Boyne City, Mich.	667.00	636.05	95.4
545	Tanning Material — Divi Pods	B	29	Columbus, Ind.	597.40	630.26	105.5
545	Tanning Material — Divi Pods	B	29	Chicago, Ill.	626.40	658.47	105.1
763	Food Prod., N.O.S. — Unfrozen — Olives in Bbls.	B	15	Terre Haute, Ind.	285.00	450.94	158.2
763	Food Prod., N.O.S. — Unfrozen — Olives in Bbls.	B	15	Chicago, Ill.	288.00	456.36	158.5
763	Food Prod., N.O.S. — Unfrozen — Citrus, Juice in Bbls.	B	15	Chicago, Ill.	288.00	456.36	158.5
				TOTALS	27,182.30	32,637.26	120.1

SUMMARY OF REVENUES, COSTS AND RATIOS
REPRESENTATIVE MOVEMENTS OF
IMPORT TRAFFIC TERMINATING IN DIFFERENTIAL TERRITORY
VIA
PORTS OF: NEW YORK, PHILADELPHIA AND BALTIMORE

Average Weight (Tons)	Destination	New York, N.Y.			Philadelphia, Pa.			Baltimore, Md.		
		Revenues	Costs	Ratio of Costs to Revenues	Revenues	Costs	Ratio of Costs to Revenues	Revenues	Costs	Ratio of Costs to Revennes
22	Massillon, O.	$303.60	$442.94	145.9%	$294.80	$287.49	97.5%	$290.40	$259.48	89.4%
22	Chicago, Ill.	444.40	557.41	125.4	435.60	401.96	92.3	431.20	373.95	86.7
21	Indianapolis, Ind.	424.20	514.05	121.2	415.80	364.52	87.7	411.60	328.99	79.9
21	Pittsburgh, Pa.	373.80	398.65	106.6	365.40	249.13	68.2	361.20	221.85	61.4
39	Pittsburgh, Pa.	405.60	613.89	151.4	390.00	357.62	91.7	382.20	317.09	83.0
39	Cleveland, O.	608.40	666.32	109.5	592.80	411.72	69.5	585.00	371.61	63.5
39	Columbus, O.	639.60	690.88	108.0	624.00	434.61	69.6	616.20	386.17	62.7
39	Detroit, Mich.	639.60	695.04	108.7	624.00	472.90	75.8	616.20	438.19	71.1
21	Cincinnati, O.	327.60	490.20	149.6	319.20	339.41	106.3	315.00	300.38	95.4
21	Cleveland, O.	289.80	438.70	151.4	281.40	290.45	103.2	277.20	263.50	95.1
21	Chicago, Ill.	403.20	542.98	134.7	394.80	393.45	99.7	390.60	366.18	93.7
21	Pittsburgh, Pa.	260.40	398.65	153.1	252.00	249.13	98.9	247.80	221.85	89.5
14	Cleveland, O.	226.80	350.19	154.4	221.20	243.30	110.0	218.40	221.46	101.4
14	Detroit, Mich.	252.00	369.49	146.6	246.40	284.41	115.4	243.60	266.21	109.3
14	Pittsburgh, Pa.	193.20	314.95	163.0	187.60	206.94	110.3	184.80	184.82	100.0
14	Dayton, O.	249.20	385.99	154.9	243.60	277.98	114.1	240.80	248.59	103.2
14	Madison, Wis.	330.40	461.51	139.7	324.80	370.28	114.0	322.00	348.16	108.1
11	Beaver Falls, Pa.	178.20	279.07	156.6	173.80	188.85	108.7	171.60	168.95	98.5
50	New Castle, Pa.	520.00	775.90	149.2	500.00	454.39	90.9	490.00	406.24	82.9
50	Barberton, O.	570.00	799.71	140.3	550.00	478.68	87.0	540.00	430.53	79.7
50	Robinson, Ill.	780.00	983.05	126.0	760.00	661.55	87.0	750.00	600.53	80.1
30	Flint, Mich.	344.00	455.74	132.5	336.00	337.77	100.5	332.00	321.86	96.9
20	Chicago, Ill.	376.00	528.54	140.6	368.00	384.95	104.6	364.00	358.42	98.5
20	St. Louis, Mo.	404.00	575.41	142.4	396.00	431.82	109.0	392.00	397.16	101.3
20	Boyne City, Mich.	667.00	636.05	95.4	655.40	468.73	71.5	649.60	451.84	69.6
20	Columbus, Ind.	597.40	630.26	105.5	585.80	431.85	73.7	580.00	385.31	66.4
20	Chicago, Ill.	626.40	658.47	105.1	614.80	461.50	75.1	609.00	428.34	70.3
15	Terre Haute, Ind.	285.00	450.94	158.2	279.00	337.00	120.8	276.00	306.74	111.1
15	Chicago, Ill.	288.00	456.36	158.5	282.00	342.42	121.4	279.00	319.57	114.5
15	Chicago, Ill.	288.00	456.36	158.5	282.00	342.42	121.4	279.00	319.57	114.5
	TOTALS	27,182.30	32,637.26	120.1	26,535.80	21,837.88	82.3	26,212.60	19,746.39	75.3

SUMMARY OF REVENUES, COSTS AND RATIOS
REPRESENTATIVE MOVEMENTS OF
EXPORT TRAFFIC TERMINATING IN DIFFERENTIAL TERRITORY
VIA
PORTS OF NEW YORK, PHILADELPHIA AND BALTIMORE

Commodity		Type of Car	Average Weight (Tons)	Origin	New York, N.Y.			P
Group No.	Description				Revenues	Costs	Ratio of Costs to Revenues	Revenues
15	Wheat Flour	B	33	Indianapolis, Ind.	$379.50	$681.31	179.5%	$372.90
17	Corn Meal	B	41	Decatur, Ill.	438.70	858.17	195.6	422.30
103	Malt	B	44	Manitowac, Wisc.	360.80	871.46	241.5	343.20
217	Meats, Cooked, Cured or Preserved	R	23	Cleveland, Ohio	377.20	537.71	142.6	
219	Packing House Prod. (Lard)	R	22	Cleveland, Ohio	360.80	525.24	145.6	
229	Butter	R	19	Chicago, Ill.	528.20	628.78	119.0	
231	Cheese	R	24	Green Bay, Wisc.	715.20	713.82	99.8	
299	Animal Tallow	B	26	Cincinnati, Ohio	509.60	557.85	109.5	499.20
45	Soybean Oil Meal	B	37	Decatur, Ill.	395.90	799.07	201.8	381.10
45	Soybean Oil Meal	B	37	Painesville, Ohio	329.30	631.30	191.7	314.50
515	Soybean Oil	B	31	Louisville, Ky.	663.40	666.47	100.5	651.00
539	Fertilizer (Ammonium Sulphate)	B	56	Bessemer, Pa.	418.88	817.16	195.1	396.48
539	Fertilizer (Ammonium Sulphate)	B	56	Gary, Ind.	638.40	1,048.23	164.2	616.00
549	Plastics	B	29	Marietta, Ohio	609.00	533.36	87.6	597.40
549	Plastics	B	29	Ottawa, Ill.	899.00	683.05	76.0	887.40
575	Billets, Iron and Steel	G	50	Canton, Ohio	532.00	777.09	146.1	512.00
583	Tin Plate	B	51	Steubenville, Ohio	489.60	778.08	158.9	469.20
583	Tin Sheets	G	36	Cleveland, Ohio	388.80	625.36	160.8	374.40
583	Tin Plate	G	50	Chicago, Ill.	760.00	962.09	126.6	740.00
583	Tin Plate	G	50	Gary, Ind.	760.00	962.09	126.6	740.00
583	Tin Plate	G	50	Detroit, Mich.	620.00	826.74	133.3	600.00
587	Iron and Steel Pipe	G	41	Aliquippa, Pa.	393.60	624.74	158.7	377.20
587	Iron and Steel Pipe	G	41	Youngstown, Ohio	426.40	655.04	153.6	410.00
587	Iron and Steel Pipe	G	41	Lorain, Ohio	442.80	684.49	154.6	426.40
595	Machinery	F	18	Oakley, Ohio	468.00	446.74	95.5	460.80
595	Machinery	G	18	Oakley, Ohio	468.00	469.16	100.2	460.80
659	Printing Paper	B	23	Hamilton, Ohio	423.20	517.27	122.2	414.00
669	Pulpboard	B	24	Rittman, Ohio	384.00	472.63	123.1	374.40
669	Pulpboard	B	24	Middletown, Ohio	398.40	519.43	130.4	388.80
697	Glass Bottles	B	18	Lancaster, Ohio	273.60	415.85	152.0	266.40

Summary of Revenues, Costs and Ratios
Representative Movements of
Export Traffic Terminating in Differential Territory
via
Ports of New York, Philadelphia and Baltimore

Type of Car	Average Weight (Tons)	Origin	New York, N.Y.			Philadelphia, Pa.			Baltimore, Md.		
			Revenues	Costs	Ratio of Costs to Revenues	Revenues	Costs	Ratio of Costs to Revenues	Revenues	Costs	Ratio of Costs to Revenues
B	33	Indianapolis, Ind.	$379.50	$681.31	179.5%	$372.90	$460.63	123.5%	$366.30	$414.55	113.2%
B	41	Decatur, Ill.	438.70	858.17	195.6	422.30	590.05	139.7	414.10	536.94	129.7
B	44	Manitowac, Wisc.	360.80	871.46	241.5	343.20	621.90	181.2	334.40	590.99	153.0
R	23	Cleveland, Ohio	377.20	537.71	142.6				363.40	322.70	88.8
R	22	Cleveland, Ohio	360.80	525.24	145.6				347.60	317.44	91.3
R	19	Chicago, Ill.	528.20	628.78	119.0				516.80	440.45	85.2
R	24	Green Bay, Wisc.	715.20	713.82	99.8				700.80	540.50	77.1
B	26	Cincinnati, Ohio	509.60	557.85	109.5	499.20	377.30	75.6	494.00	333.57	67.5
B	37	Decatur, Ill.	395.90	799.07	201.8	381.10	554.67	145.5	373.70	505.07	135.2
B	37	Painesville, Ohio	329.30	631.30	191.7	314.50	392.16	124.7	307.10	358.78	116.8
B	31	Louisville, Ky.	663.40	666.47	100.5	651.00	456.16	70.1	644.80	407.74	63.2
B	56	Bessemer, Pa.	418.88	817.16	195.1	396.48	460.08	116.0	385.28	407.03	105.6
B	56	Gary, Ind.	638.40	1,048.23	164.2	616.00	691.15	112.2	604.80	638.10	105.5
B	20	Marietta, Ohio	609.00	533.36	87.6	597.40	334.95	56.1	591.60	288.41	48.8
B	20	Ottawa, Ill.	899.00	683.05	76.0	887.40	486.09	54.8	881.60	452.93	51.4
G	50	Canton, Ohio	532.00	777.09	146.1	512.00	446.34	87.2	502.00	335.78	66.9
B	51	Steubenville, Ohio	489.60	778.08	158.9	469.20	450.65	96.0	459.00	401.29	87.4
G	36	Cleveland, Ohio	388.80	625.36	160.8	374.40	380.12	101.5	367.20	301.17	82.0
G	50	Chicago, Ill.	760.00	962.09	126.6	740.00	631.34	85.3	730.00	520.78	71.3
G	50	Gary, Ind.	760.00	962.09	126.6	740.00	631.34	85.3	730.00	520.78	71.3
G	50	Detroit, Mich.	626.00	826.74	133.3	600.00	538.84	89.8	590.00	435.59	73.8
G	41	Aliquippa, Pa.	393.60	624.74	158.7	377.20	347.81	92.2	369.00	257.29	69.7
G	41	Youngstown, Ohio	426.40	655.04	153.6	410.00	378.11	92.2	401.80	288.06	71.7
G	41	Lorain, Ohio	442.80	684.40	154.6	426.40	409.36	96.0	418.20	319.31	76.4
F	18	Oakley, Ohio	468.00	446.74	95.5	460.80	308.41	66.9	457.20	259.15	56.7
G	18	Oakley, Ohio	468.00	469.16	100.2	460.80	328.39	71.3	457.20	276.20	60.4
B	23	Hamilton, Ohio	423.20	517.27	122.2	414.00	354.57	85.6	409.40	313.66	76.6
B	24	Rittman, Ohio	384.00	472.63	123.1	374.40	305.65	81.6	369.60	276.51	74.8
B	24	Middletown, Ohio	398.40	519.43	130.4	388.80	352.12	90.6	384.00	313.95	81.8
B	18	Lancaster, Ohio	273.60	415.85	152.0	266.40	282.91	106.2	262.80	246.69	93.9

SUMMARY OF REVENUES, COSTS AND RATIOS
REPRESENTATIVE MOVEMENTS OF
EXPORT TRAFFIC TERMINATING IN DIFFERENTIAL TERRITORY
VIA
PORTS OF NEW YORK, PHILADELPHIA AND BALTIMORE

Commodity		Type of Car	Average Weight (Tons)	Origin	New York, N.Y.		
Group No.	Description				Revenues	Costs	Ratio of Costs to Revenues
763	Food Products, N.O.S., Unfrozen (Milk)	B	26	Columbus, Ohio	$390.00	$522.30	133.9%
505	Lubricating Oil	B	24	Rouseville, Pa.	336.00	438.87	130.6
773	Feed, Animal or Poultry	B	32	Battle Creek, Mich.	406.40	649.23	159.8
773	Feed, Animal or Poultry	B	32	Toledo, Ohio	320.00	617.86	193.1
215	Fresh Meats	R	20	Chicago, Ill.	748.00	643.04	86.0
239	Hides and Skins	B	44	Chicago, Ill.	941.60	875.01	92.9
591	Agricultural Implements	F	25	Racine, Wisc.	415.00	600.14	144.6
623	Vehicle Parts	B	37	Detroit, Mich.	769.60	668.99	86.9
627	Tires and Tubes	B	14	Akron, Ohio	305.20	346.83	113.6
627	Tires and Tubes	B	14	Cleveland, Ohio	305.20	350.19	114.7
707	Refrigerators	B	10	Appliance Park (Louisville), Ky.	356.00	369.74	103.9
1	Wheat	B	55	Chicago, Ill.	[3]374.00	549.74	147.0
1	Wheat	B	55	Columbus, O.	506.00	414.29	81.9
3	Corn	B	55	Chicago, Ill.	[3]374.00	549.65	147.0
3	Corn	B	55	Indianapolis, Ind.	506.00	503.92	99.6
613	Automobiles, Pass., S.U.	B	6.25	Flint, Mich.	[1]327.50	274.74	83.9
613	Automobiles, Pass., S.U.	B	10	Flint, Mich.	524.00	324.10	61.9
613	Automobiles, Pass., S.U.	B	6.25	Detroit, Mich.	311.25	268.57	86.3
613	Automobiles, Pass., S.U.	B	10	Detroit, Mich.	498.00	317.40	63.7
613	Automobiles, Pass., S.U.	B	7.5	Detroit, Mich.	[2]315.00	284.85	90.4
613	Automobiles, Pass., S.U.	B	10	Detroit, Mich.	420.00	317.40	75.6
				TOTALS	24,301.03	30,176.55	124.2

[1] Not applicable for account N.Y.C.R.R. as origin carrier.
[2] Applicable only for N.Y.C.R.R. as origin carrier.
[3] Reshipping rate.

SUMMARY OF REVENUES, COSTS AND RATIOS
REPRESENTATIVE MOVEMENTS OF
EXPORT TRAFFIC TERMINATING IN DIFFERENTIAL TERRITORY
VIA
PORTS OF NEW YORK, PHILADELPHIA AND BALTIMORE

Type of Car	Average Weight (Tons)	Origin	New York, N.Y.			Philadelphia, Pa.			Baltimore, Md.		
			Revenues	Costs	Ratio of Costs to Revenues	Revenues	Costs	Ratio of Costs to Revenues	Revenues	Costs	Ratio of Costs to Revenues
B	26	Columbus, Ohio	$390.00	$522.30	133.9%	$379.60	$343.12	90.4%	$374.40	$305.61	81.6%
B	24	Rouseville, Pa.	336.00	438.87	130.6	326.40	275.57	84.4	321.60	255.11	79.3
B	32	Battle Creek, Mich.	406.40	649.23	159.8	393.60	446.57	113.5	387.20	411.20	106.2
B	32	Toledo, Ohio	320.00	617.86	193.1	307.20	404.24	131.6	300.80	368.87	122.6
R	20	Chicago, Ill.	748.00	643.04	86.0				736.00	447.48	60.8
B	44	Chicago, Ill.	941.60	875.01	92.9	924.00	589.09	63.8	915.20	544.87	59.5
F	25	Racine, Wisc.	415.00	600.14	144.6	405.00	437.70	108.1	400.00	384.44	96.1
B	37	Detroit, Mich.	769.60	668.99	86.9	754.80	457.81	60.7	747.40	424.23	56.8
B	14	Akron, Ohio	305.20	346.83	113.6	299.60	239.10	79.8	296.80	217.27	73.2
B	14	Cleveland, Ohio	305.20	350.19	114.7	299.60	243.30	81.2	296.80	221.46	74.6
B	10	Appliance Park (Louisville), Ky.	356.00	369.74	103.9	352.00	284.42	80.8	350.00	255.71	73.1
B	55	Chicago, Ill.	$374.00	549.74	147.0	$363.00	462.70	127.5	$357.50	434.86	121.6
B	55	Columbus, O.	506.00	414.29	81.9	495.00	327.25	66.1	489.50	289.85	59.2
B	55	Chicago, Ill.	$374.00	549.65	147.0	$363.00	462.70	127.5	$357.50	434.86	121.6
B	55	Indianapolis, Ind.	506.00	503.92	99.6	495.00	416.88	84.2	489.50	375.95	76.8
B	6.25	Flint, Mich.	$327.50	274.74	83.9	325.00	232.16	71.4	323.75	223.82	69.1
B	10	Flint, Mich.	524.00	324.10	61.9	520.00	260.96	50.2	518.00	250.56	48.4
B	6.25	Detroit, Mich.	311.25	268.57	86.3	308.75	225.98	73.2	307.50	212.90	69.2
B	10	Detroit, Mich.	498.00	317.40	63.7	494.00	254.25	51.5	492.00	238.69	48.5
B	7.5	Detroit, Mich.	$315.00	284.85	90.4						
B	10	Detroit, Mich.	420.00	317.40	75.6						
		TOTALS	24,301.03	30,176.55	124.2	20,301.43	17,934.90	88.34	22,695.13	17,919.15	78.96